Some Evidence Regarding Education and Guruship for Vaishnavis

By Bhaktarupa Das and Madhavananda Das January 2013

Introduction

In ISKCON, while women are generally recognized informally as spiritual teachers, no woman has so far been formally allowed to serve as an initiating spiritual master, $d\bar{i}k_{\bar{i}}\bar{a}$ -guru. Now there is a proposal to allow a woman to take up this role, and this has created some controversy. The resulting discussion has inspired many devotees to look more closely at the roots of our movement to find authoritative answers from guru, $s\bar{a}dhu$, and $s\bar{a}stra$ about what are absolute principles and what are possible adjustments. The present paper is primarily an exploration into $s\bar{a}stra$ regarding the roles and responsibilities of $vaisnav\bar{i}s$. We examine statements on the social and spiritual role of ladies from the Upanishads, the Vedas, and some of the principal commentaries on them. Since for Gaudīya Vaisṇavas the authority on religious ritual is $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also examine the texts therein as well as some relevant points from $ari-bhakti-vil\bar{a}sa$, we also exam

Srila Prabhupada expected ISKCON's managers to deal with complex issues that they may come to face by considering all aspects and arriving at a decision through proper discussion:

Personally I wish all the existing GBC may be trained up so perfectly that in the future in my absence they can manage the whole Society very nicely and strongly. That is my desire. At least in this stage of my life it is not at all desirable that there be any factions amongst yourselves. Try to settle up amicably and correct yourself. One man is trained up with great difficulty, especially in spiritual life. Everyone has got some weakness and deficiency. It is better to correct or mend it than to break it. It will be best to discuss this in an open meeting of the GBC and then do the needful. (Letter to Hamsaduta, 29 September 1974.)

A bibliography has been provided at the end of this paper that specifies the sources used in its preparation.

WOMEN IN THE VEDAS

The Vedic age can be described correctly only in the language of the Vedas and its supporting literature — the various $br\bar{a}hman$, upani, ab, etc. The following passages offer an insight into the position and rights of women in the Vedic age.

CREATED AS EQUAL HALVES

The Brhad- $\bar{a}ranyaka$ -upanişad^[1] (1.4.3) contains the following passage —

sa dvitīyam aicchat. sa haitāvān āsa yathā strīpumāmsau sampariṣvaktau. sa imam evātmānam dvedhāpātayat. tataḥ patiś ca patnī cābhavatām. tasmād idam ardhabṛgalam iva sva iti ha smāha yājñavalkyaḥ.

He (the Supreme Lord) desired a partner. Assuming a form as great as the form of a man and woman combined, he divided this great form of himself and thus two equal parts fell, from which husbands and wives, respectively, were produced. Therefore, $Y\bar{a}j\tilde{n}avalkya$ said that both of us are like two equal halves of a shell.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO EDUCATION AND CELIBACY

Direct evidence supporting the equal right to education is found in the *Atharva-veda*^[2] (11.5.18) as follows,

brahmacaryena kanyā yuvānam vindate patim

Through *brahmacarya* a girl attains a suitable husband.

So what is this *brahmacarya? Sāyaṇa*, the most prominent commentator on all the four Vedas, comments on the above *Atharva-veda* section:

brahmacaryena brahma vedah tad-adhyayanārtham-ācaryam

The word brahmacaryena means "by all efforts employed to study the Vedas in order to know Brahman".

The Śrīmad-bhāgavatam speaks of two ladies attaining to complete Vedic knowledge:

tebhyo dadhāra kanye dve vayunām dhāriṇīm svadhā ubhe te brahma-vādinyau jñāna-vijñāna-pārage

Svadhā, who was offered to the *Pitās*, begot two daughters named *Vayunā* and *Dhāriṇī*, both of whom were impersonalists and were expert in transcendental and Vedic knowledge. (4.1.64)

SOME HYMNS RESERVED FOR THEM

There are many hymns in the Rg-veda that are reserved for recitation only by women. An example (Rg-veda^[3] 10.159.1-2) speaks about a woman's qualification to speak on transcendental topics:

ud asau sūryo agād ud ayam māmako bhagaḥ aham tad vidvalā patim abhy asākṣi viṣāsahiḥ

aham ketur aham mūrdhāhamugrā vivācanī mamed anu kratum patih sehānāyā upācaret

Let my good fortune rise with the rising sun. May I attain my husband, defeat my enemies, and may I always be very tolerant. May I be an excellent knower of the Vedas, and a powerful speaker on the same. May my husband always be pleasing and behave tolerantly towards me.

TRANSMITTERS OF VEDIC KNOWLEDGE

In the Brhad-devatā^[4] (2.82) of Śaunaka Ṣṣi, the names of no less than twenty-six women who have contributed hymns to the Vedas are listed. This means that they have composed, practiced, taught, and initiated others in these hymns, for only the creator of a hymn or those coming in the creator's disciplic succession can initiate others. Many of these hymns can still be found today in the Vedas. The list of women is as follows,

ghoṣā godhā viśvavārā apālopaniṣanniṣat brahma-jāyā juhūr-nāma agastyasya svasāditiḥ indrāṇī cendramātā ca saramā romaśorvaśī lopāmudrā ca nadyaś-ca yamī nārī ca śaśvatī śrīr-lākṣā sārparājñī vāk-śraddhā medhā ca dakṣiṇā rātrī sūryā ca sāvitrī brahma-vādinya īritāḥ

Ghoṣā, Godhā, Viśvavārā, Apālā, Upaniṣat, Niṣat, Brahmajāyā also known as Juhū, Aditi – the sister of Agastya, Indrāṇi, the Mother of Indra, Saramā, Romaśā, Urvaśī, Lopāmudrā, the river Yamī, the river Nārī and the river Śaśvatī, Śrī, Lakṣā, Sārparājñī, Vāk, Śraddhā, Medhā, Dakṣiṇā, Rātrī and Sūryā – also known as Sāvitrī – are famous as knowers of Brahman and are [the contributors of Vedic hymns].

ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE THE GAYATRI AND THE SACRED THREAD

The Yama-smṛti^[5] specifies the right of women to study Vedas and receive the thread,

purā-kalpe tu nārīṇāṁ mauñjī-bandhanam-iṣyate adhyāpanaṁ ca vedānāṁ sāvitrī vacanaṁ tathā

Previously women were initiated with Brahmin threads and would teach the Vedas and acquire knowledge of the $G\bar{a}yatr\bar{\iota}$.

Thus, there are quite a few places in the Vedas where women have been encouraged to teach and perform all kinds of sacrifices, including initiations.

JAIMINI AND AITISAYANA

Jaimini is the renowned composer of the literature known as *Pūrva-mīmāmsā sūtras*. According to the Śrīmad-bhāgavatam (1.4.21), he is the professor of the *Sāma-veda* and the direct disciple of Vyasadeva.

Jaimini's Pūrva-mīmāmsā sūtras have been referred to by many ācāryas in their works, e.g. Srila Jiva Goswami in his Kṛṣṇa-sandarbha and Srila Baladeva Vidyabhushan in his Govinda-bhāṣya. Both these ācāryas quote Pūrva-mīmāmsā sūtras as a valid and acceptable authority.

As Jaimini was compiling the $P\bar{u}rva$ - $m\bar{u}m\bar{a}ms\bar{a}$ $s\bar{u}tras$, he wished to tackle the case of equal rights for women in all sacrifices (including $d\bar{i}ks\bar{a}$). He was well aware of the school of a certain sage named Aitisayana, who had declared that all these sacrifices were only for the higher three classes and not for women and $s\bar{u}dras$. Jaimini discussed this issue in the first chapter of the sixth part of his $P\bar{u}rva$ - $m\bar{u}m\bar{u}m\bar{s}\bar{u}s\bar{s}$ $s\bar{u}tras$. The famous Vedic commentator Shabara-swami commented on these $s\bar{u}tras$. We are reproducing here the entire section along with the commentary of Shabara-swami.

The entire discussion revolves around the word $svarga-k\bar{a}mah$ in the following aphorism in the $\acute{S}ruti$ —

darśa-pūrṇa-māsābhyām svarga-kāmo yajeta (Āpastambha Śrauta Sūtra 3.9.4)

One who desires heaven should perform the Darśa and Pūrṇa-māsa sacrifices.

Jaimini in the $P\bar{u}rva$ - $m\bar{u}m\bar{a}m\bar{s}\bar{a}$ $s\bar{u}tras^{[6]}$ (6.1.3.6) presents the view of the opposite party ($p\bar{u}rva$ -pak,samplea) first,

linga-viśeṣa-nirdeśāt pum-yuktam-aitiśāyanaḥ (Sūtra 6)

The Sage Aitisayana says that since the gender used in the aphorism is masculine ($svarga-k\bar{a}ma\dot{h}$), therefore only males are eligible.

Commentary: darśa-pūrṇa-māsābhyām svarga-kāmo yajetetyevam-ādi samāmnāyate. tatra sandehaḥ. kim svarga-kāmam pumāmsam-adhikṛtya yajetety-eṣa śabda uccaritaḥ? atha vā'niyamaḥ striyam pumāmsam ca? iti. kim prāptam? pum-lingam-adhikṛtam mene aitiśāyanaḥ. kutaḥ? linga-viśeṣa-nirdeśāt. pum-lingena viśeṣeṇa nirdeśo bhavati, svarga-kāmo yajeteti. tasmāt pumān-ukto yajeteti, na strī.

Translation of Commentary: The aphorism 'One who desires heaven should perform the Darśa and $P\bar{u}r\eta a$ -māsa sacrifices' is seen in the Vedas. In that there is a doubt. Is the aphorism recited keeping in mind only a male, or both male and female? The sage Aitisayana says that only males are eligible. Why? It is because the masculine gender has been specified in the word svarga- $k\bar{a}ma\dot{p}$ in the aphorism. This word refers to a man, and therefore only men are allowed, and not women.

Jaimini then gives his conclusion:

jātim tu bādarāyaṇo 'viśeṣāt tasmāt stry api pratīyeta jāty arthasyāviśiṣṭatvāt (Sūtra 8)

Vyasa, however, says that both ladies and men belonging to the upper three classes are fit for all sacrifices, as there is no distinction of class between males and females in the word <code>svarga-kāmah</code>.

Commentary: tu-śabdaḥ pakṣam vyāvartayati. naitadasti pumso 'dhikāra iti. jātim tu bādarāyaṇo 'dhikṛtām manyate sma āha. kim-ayam svarga-kāma iti jāti-śabdaḥ samadhigataḥ? netyāha. katham tarhi? yaugikaḥ, svargecchā-yogena vartate. kena tarhi śabdena jātir-uktā yā adhikṛteti gamyate. nava ca vayam brūmo jātivacana iha śabdo 'dhikāraka iti. kim tarhi? svarga-kāma śabdenobhāva 'pi strī-pumsāvadhi kriyate iti. ato na vilakṣitam pum-lingam iti. kutah? aviśeṣāt. na hi śaknoty-eṣā vibhaktiḥ svarga-kāmam lingena viśiṣṭum. katham? lakṣaṇatvena śravaṇāt. svarge kāmo yasya tameva lakṣayati śabdaḥ. tena lakṣaṇenādhikṛto yajeteti śabdena ucyate. tatra lakṣaṇam-aviśiṣṭam striyām pumsi ca. tasmāc-chabdenobhāva 'pi strī-pumsāv-adhikṛtāv-iti gamyate. tatra kenādhikāraḥ striyā nivartyate? vibhaktyā iti cet. tan-na. kasmāt? pum-vacanatvāt. strī-nivṛttāv-aśaktiḥ. pumso vibhaktyā punar-vacanam-anarthakam-iti ced na. ānarthakyo 'pi strī-nivṛtter-abhāvaḥ. parīsankhyāyām svārtha-hāniḥ. parārtha-kalpanā prāpta-bādhaś ca. na cānarthakyam. nirdeśārthatvāt. tasmāt stry api pratīyeta jāty arthasyāviśistatvāt.

Translation of Commentary: By the word 'tu' in this sūtra, the pūrva-pakṣa is refuted. It is not that only males have the right. Those belonging to the upper three classes, whether men or women, are bonafide, as said by Vyasadeva. A question is to be asked here. Is the word 'svarga-kāmaḥ' to be considered as a word which defines a group or as a word which points to a single person? The other party says, "It cannot point to a group, because the way in which it is grammatically formed points only to a single person, and that also a male."

However, we (the *uttara-pakṣa*) say that the word 'svarga-kāmaḥ' cannot refer only to a male. Why? Because of its non-speciality. The word cannot be restricted only to the male species because it emphasizes eligibility over gender. The emphasis is on the fact that "One who desires heaven should perform sacrifices." The rightful performers of the sacrifice are indicated by the word 'yajet'. If it is said that the word 'svarga-kāmaḥ' is of masculine gender by rules of grammar, then we (the *uttara-pakṣa*) say that it is not so, for assuming that only males are indicated will lead to the following problem:

The purpose of the word <code>svarga-kāmaḥ</code> is to state that whosoever desires to go to heaven should perform the sacrifices. Since it is a well-observed fact that even women desire heaven, if the purpose of the original aphorism was to state that only men should perform the sacrifices then the language would have had to include specific wording to state that it did not apply to women.

Therefore, women are also included in the three higher *varnas* that can perform sacrifices.

Thus, in the opinion of Vyasadeva, even women are eligible to perform all sacrifices.

Later commentators also give the example that the statement ' $br\bar{a}hman$ on a hantavyan' — a $br\bar{a}hman$ should never be killed — also includes a $br\bar{a}hman$. This shows that even though male species may be indicated in an aphorism, it often includes females.

Moreover, the original *sūtra* contained the name of a sacrifice, '*Pūrṇa-māsa*'. Ladies who performed these sacrifices are thus rightfully known as '*Paurṇa-māsī*'.

MANU-SAMHITA

Srila Prabhupada often quoted the following selections from Manu-samhitā^[7]:

na strī svātantryam-arhati (9.3)

Women should not be given independence.

And also,

pravṛttir eṣa bhūtānāṁ nivṛttis tu mahā-phalaḥ (5.56)

Everyone in material life is attracted to furthering the way of attachment (*pravṛtti-mārga*), but the greatest treasure is to be gained by following the path of detachment (*nivṛtti-mārga*).

However, Srila Prabhupada did not always support the conclusions of this literature:

Yes, but we do not keep him śūdra. A devotee is no longer śūdra. We are creating brāhmaṇas. Just like these Europeans and Americans. They, according to Manu-saṁhitā, are mlecchas, yavanas. But we are not keeping them mlecchas and yavanas. Just like these European and American boys. They are accepting the Vedic regulative principles: no illicit sex, no meateating, no intoxication, no gambling. So they are no more śūdras or caṇḍālas. They are brāhmanas. (Room Conversation, 5 June 1974.)

According to the *Manu-saṁhitā* you are all *mlecchas* and *yavanas*. You cannot touch the *Manu-saṁhitā*, what to speak of translating it. So if you try to follow the *Manu-saṁhitā* then you become a *mleccha* and *yavana* and your career is finished. (Secretary's letter to Madhusudana, 19 May 1977.)

CONTRADICTIONS

Manu-saṁhitā says different things about women. Sometimes its thrust is to speak highly of them:

prajanārtham mahā-bhāgāḥ pūjārhā gṛha-dīptayaḥ (9.26)

Women are to be worshipped. They are extremely auspicious. They are the illuminators of the home.

yatra nāryastu pūjyante ramante tatra devatāḥ yatraitāstu na pūjyante sarvās-tatrāphalāḥ kriyāḥ (3.56)

Wherever women are worshipped, the demigods reside, and wherever they are not worshiped, all activities end in failure.

While some other sections speak derogatorily:

paumścalyāc cala cittāc ca naisnehyāc ca svabhāvataḥ (9.15)

Women are by nature adulterous, fickle-hearted, and devoid of all love.

nirindriyā hy amantrāś ca striyo 'nṛtam iti sthitiḥ (9.18)

Women are to be considered as devoid of all sense, devoid of all mantras, and full of falsity.

Sometimes we even find both kinds of statements in the same chapter — Chapter 9. No statement is offered directly in Manu-samhit \bar{a} that resolves this incongruity.

INTERPOLATIONS

Taking note of this and other points, various scholars have opined that the Manu-samhitā we see today has suffered from considerable interpolation. In the introduction to the earliest known commentary on the Manu-samhitā by Medhatithi^[8], we find the following verse written by the scribe of the commentary:

mānyā kāpi manu-smṛtis-tad-ucitā vyākhyāpi medhātitheḥ sā luptaiva vidher-vaśād kvacid-api prāpyam na tat-pustakam kṣoṇīndro madanaḥ sahāraṇa-suto deśāntarād-āhṛtaiḥ jīrnoddhāram-acīkarat tata itas-tat-pustakair likhyate

Earlier, there was another *Manu-samhitā* with a suitable commentary by Medhatithi. That is, however, lost now due to the influence of providence and is no longer available. The king named *Madana*, the son of *Sahāraṇa*, procured some scattered portions from various places and the remaining book was rewritten.

Srila Bhaktivinode Thakura also speaks about Manu-samhit \bar{a} 's interpolations in his introduction to the Krsna-samhit $\bar{a}^{[9]}$,

The <code>varṇāśrama</code> system continued purely for a long time, until Jamadagni and his son Parashuram, of <code>kṣatrīya</code> natures, claimed themselves as <code>brāhmaṇas</code>. By following a <code>varṇa</code> contrary to their nature out of self interest, they created friction between the <code>brāhmaṇa</code> and <code>kṣatrīya</code> classes. Because of this seed of enmity between the two classes, the procedure of judging <code>varṇa</code> by birth became fixed. In time, this system of <code>varṇas</code> without reference to nature entered covertly in the <code>Manu-saṃhitā</code> and other scriptures.

NOT APPLICABLE IN KALI YUGA

Even if one were to believe that the Manu-samhitā that is found today is not an interpolated version of the original one, one would still be discouraged to accept it as a current authority by the following statement of the $Par\bar{a}\acute{s}ara$ -smrti^[10],

kṛte tu mānavā dharmās tretāyām gautamāḥ smṛtāḥ dvāpare śānkhalikhitāḥ kalau pārāśarāḥ smṛtāḥ (1.24)

The Manu-samhitā is applicable in Satya-yuga, the Gautama-smṛti is applicable in Tretā-yuga, the Śaṅkha-likhita-smṛti is applicable in Dvāpara-yuga and the Parāśara-smṛti is applicable in Kali-yuga.

NOT A PRINCIPAL AUTHORITY

A similar point is made by Srila Madhvācārya in his work Mahābhārata-tātparya-nirṇaya [11]:

vaiṣṇavāni purāṇāni pañcarātrātmakatvataḥ pramāṇāny eva manvādyāḥ smṛtayo 'py anukūlataḥ

Purāṇas which establish the supremacy of Vishnu are authority as they convey what is stated in *Pañcarātra*. *Smṛti śāstras* like those of Manu and others are also authority so far as they are consistent with these. (Part I)

APPARENT CONTRADICTION IN THE HARI-BHAKTI-VILASA

The Hari-bhakti-vilāsa is the law book of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas. Evidence is found in the Hari-bhakti-vilāsa regarding ladies giving mantras. Before we consider that, there is a certain precaution which Srila Prabhupada gives us regarding Hari-bhakti-vilāsa:

Actually, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī collected only a summary of the elaborate descriptions of Vaiṣṇava regulative principles from the Hari-bhakti-vilāsa. It is Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī's opinion, however, that to follow the Hari-bhakti-vilāsa strictly is to actually follow the Vaiṣṇava rituals in perfect order. He claims that the smārta-samāja, which is strictly followed by caste brāhmaṇas, has influenced portions that Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī collected from the original Hari-bhakti-vilāsa. It is therefore very difficult to find out Vaiṣṇava directions from the book of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī. It is better to consult the commentary made by Sanātana Gosvāmī himself for the Hari-bhakti-vilāsa under the name of Dig-darśinī-ṭīkā. Some say that the same commentary was compiled by Gopīnātha-pūjā Adhikārī, who was engaged in the service of Śrī Rādhā-ramaṇajī and who happened to be one of the disciples of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī. (Purport to Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya 1.35)

Having seen this, let's examine the positive and negative evidence from Hari-bhakti- $vil\bar{a}sa^{[12]}$ regarding female $d\bar{\imath}ks\bar{a}$ gurus:

Positive Evidence

tāntrikeşu ca mantreşu dīkṣāyām yoṣitām api sādhvīnām adhikāro 'sti śūdrādīnām ca sad-dhiyām (1.194)

In all matters of initiations in *tantras* and *mantras*, saintly ladies have all rights, and so do the \dot{su} dras and others who are dedicated to serving their spiritual masters. (The word 'adhikāraḥ' is to be noted in the original Sanskrit.)

āgamoktena mārgeņa strī-śūdrair api pūjanam kartavyam śraddhayā viṣṇoś cintayitvā patim hṛdi (1.195)

Through the path shown in the $\bar{a}gamas$, ladies and $\pm \bar{u}dras$ can also worship the deities. They should faithfully perform such worship, thinking about their respective Lords in their hearts.

strīṇām apy adhikāro 'sti viṣṇor ārādhanādiṣu pati-priya-ratānāṁ ca śrutir eṣā sanātanī (1.197)

Ladies too have all right to conduct the worship, etc., of Lord Vishnu, and so do those girls who are unmarried and desire a suitable husband. This is the verdict of the eternal *śruti*. (Again, the word 'adhikāraḥ' is to be noted in the original Sanskrit.)

agastya-samhitāyām śrī-rāma-mantra-rājam uddiśya śucivratatamāḥ śūdrā dhārmikā dvija-sevakāḥ striyaḥ pati-vratāś cānye pratilomānulomajāḥ lokāś cāṇḍāla-paryantāḥ sarve 'py atrādhikāriṇaḥ (1.198)

In the *Agastya Samhitā*, indicating the Śrī-rāma-mantra-rāja, it is said, "All have equal qualification for this mantra, whether they be a śūdra who is dedicated to his vows and eager to serve the brāhmaṇas, ladies who are dedicated to their husbands, or dog-eaters who are born of any type of marriage (pratiloma or anuloma)."

svapna-labdhe striyā datte mālā-mantre ca try akṣare ekāksare tathā mantre siddhādīn naiva śodhayet (1.211)

One should not ritually purify a mantra obtained in a dream, a mantra given by a woman, a mālā-mantra [a mantra of over twenty syllables] or mantras of one or three syllables for siddha and so on.

gṛhasthā vanagāś caiva yatayo brahmacāriṇaḥ striyaḥ śūdrādayaś caiva sarve yatrādhikāriṇaḥ (1.218)

The *gṛhastha*, *vānaprastha*, *sannyāsī*, *brahmacārī*, ladies and *śūdras* are all eligible to receive the [*Gopāla*] mantra. (The word '*adhikārināh*' is again to be noted in the original Sanskrit.)

striyo vā yadi vā śūdrā brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyādayaḥ pūjayitvā śilā-cakraṁ labhante śāśvataṁ padam (Hari-bhakti-vilāsa 5.452)

All attain to the eternal spiritual world by worshipping the *śālagrāma-śilā*, whether a lady, a *śūdra*, *brāhmana*, *kṣatriya*, etc.

NEGATIVE EVIDENCE

yoşito nāvamanyeta na cāsām viśvased budhaḥ na caiversyur bhavet tāsu nādhikuryāt kadācana (Hari-bhakti-vilāsa 11.708)

A wise man should not disregard, nor put faith in a woman. He should not become envious of them and **should never give them any authority or rights**. (Emphasis added.)

RESOLVING THE CONTRADICTION

The compound word *nādhikuryāt* in the negative evidence directly contradicts the word *adhikāriṇāḥ* in the previous positive evidence. How to resolve this contradiction? The *Laghu-bhāgavatāmṛta* (5.327) says:

virodho vākyayor yatra nāprāmāṇyaṁ tad iṣyate yathāviruddhatā ca syāt tadārthaḥ kalpyate tayoḥ

An explanation of two apparently contradictory statements should leave no scope for ambiguity. Instead, an explanation which leaves no contradictions should be sought.

The *nādhikuryāt kadācana* statement in the *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* which speaks against women being given authority or rights has been taken from the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*. A closer look at the current editions of the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* gives the original Sanskrit text of the statement in a different way that completely changes the meaning:

In the $Visnu-pur\bar{a}na$ editions published by two separate publishers^{[13][14]}, the same verse is found as follows,

yoşito nāvamanyeta na cāsām viśvased budhaḥ na caiverṣyā bhavet tāsu na dhik kuryāt kadācana (3.12.30)

A wise man should neither disregard nor put faith in a woman. He should not become envious of them and **should never curse them**. (Emphasis added.)

A simple change from nādhikuryāt kadācana to na-dhik-kuryāt kadācana (changing 'nā' to 'na' and 'ku' to 'kku') makes a world of difference in the way the verse is understood.

Some may be inclined to think that this version of na-dhik- $kury\bar{a}t$ $kad\bar{a}cana$ might be a recent interpolation in the $Vi\bar{s}nu$ - $pur\bar{a}na$. However, in the commentary of $\hat{S}r\bar{\imath}la$ $\hat{S}r\bar{\imath}lhar$ $Sv\bar{a}m\bar{\imath}$ (written sometime between 1350 and 1450 AD) on this verse of $Vi\bar{s}nu$ - $pur\bar{a}na^{[15]}$ the alternate reading is recognized:

na dhik kuryāt dhik-kāraṁ na kuryāt (commentary on the same verse)

'Na dhik kuryāt' means one that should not curse them.

In this way all of the statements of Hari-bhakti-vilāsa can be reconciled.

HARI-BHAKTI-VILASA ON RESTRICTIONS OF WOMEN AND SUDRAS

While presenting codes of behavior, *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* distinguishes between ladies who are *vaiṣṇavas* and those who are not:

ato niṣedhakaṁ yad yad vacanaṁ śrūyate sphuṭam avaisnava-paraṁ tat tad vijñeyaṁ tattva-darśibhih (5.453)

Therefore, wherever restrictive statements are to be found in scriptures [regarding \dot{su} dras or women], those statements are understood by the learned souls as applicable to non-vai, \dot{s} , \dot{s} ,

yathā brāhmaṇasyaiva pūjyo 'haṁ śucer apy aśucer api strī-śūdra-kara-saṁsparśo vajrād api suduḥsahaḥ praṇavoccāraṇāccaiva śālagrāma-śilārcanāt brāhmaṇī-qamanāc caiva śūdraś caṇḍālatām iyāt (5.454 - 455)

For example, the Lord says, "I am to be worshipped only by the $br\bar{a}hman$, whether they are clean or unclean. The touch of the hands of a woman or $s\bar{u}dra$ is worse than a thunderbolt to me. If a $s\bar{u}dra$ utters the pran [om], worships the $s\bar{a}lagrama-sil\bar{a}$, or cohabits with a $br\bar{a}hman$ lady, then such a $s\bar{u}dra$ will attain the more degraded status of a dog-eater.

Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī explains the mood of this verse in his detailed purport as follows:

tad eva śrī-nāradoktyā pramāṇayati — brāhmaṇeti. satām vaiṣṇavānām śūdrāṇām, śālagrāme śrī-śālagrāma-śilārcane, anyeṣām asatām śūdrāṇām. ataeva śūdram adhikṛtyoktam vāyu-purāṇe—

ayācakaḥ pradātā syāt kṛṣiṁ vṛtty artham ācaret purāṇaṁ śṛṇuyān nityaṁ śālagrāmaṁ ca pūjayet iti.

evam mahā-purāṇānām vacanaiḥ saha—brāhmaṇasyaiva pūjyo 'ham iti vacanasya virodhān mātsarya-paraiḥ smārtaiḥ kaiścit kalpitam iti mantavyam. yadi ca yuktyā siddham sa-mūlam syāt tarhi cāvaiṣṇaviḥ śūdrais tādṛśībhiś ca strībhis tat-pūjā na kartavyā, yathā-vidhi gṛhīta-viṣṇu-dīkṣākaiś ca taiḥ kartavyeti vyavasthāpanīyam. yataḥ śūdreṣv antyajeṣv api madhye ye vaiṣṇavās te śūdrādayo na kilocyante. tathā ca nāradīye—

śvapaco'pi mahīpāla viṣṇor bhakto dvijodhikaḥ iti

itihāsa-samuccaye na śūdrā bhagavad-bhaktam niṣādam śvapacam tathā vīkṣate jāti-sāmānyāt sa yāti narakam dhruvam iti

pādme ca na śūdrā bhagavad-bhaktās te tu bhāgavatā narāḥ. sarva-varṇeṣu te śūdrā ye na bhaktā janārdane iti

etad-ādikam cāgre vaiṣṇava-māhātmye vistareṇa vyaktam bhāvi. kim ca, bhagavad-dīkṣā-prabhāvena śūdrādīnām api vipra-sāmyam siddham eva. tathā ca tatra—yathā kāñcanatām yāti ity ādi. etac ca prāg-dīkṣā-māhātmye likhitam eva. ata eva tṛtīya-skandhe devahūti-vākyam [Śrīmad-bhāgavatam 3.33.6]—

yan-nāma-dheya-śravaṇānukīrtanād yat-prahvaṇād yat-smaraṇād api kvacit. śvādo 'pi sadyaḥ savanāya kalpate kutaḥ punas te bhagavan nu darśanāt iti

savanāya yajanāya kalpate yogyo bhavatīty arthaḥ. ata eva vipraiḥ saha vaiṣṇavānām ekatraiva gaṇanā. tathā ca hari-bhakti-sudhodaye śrī-bhagavad-brahma-saṃvāde—

tīrthāny aśvattha-taravo gāvo viprās tathā svayam mad-bhaktāś ceti vijñeyāh pañca te tanavo mama iti

caturtha-skandhe [Śrīmad-bhāgavatam 4.21.12] śrī-pṛthu-mahārāja-varṇane—sarvatrāskhalitādeśaḥ sapta-dvīpaika-daṇḍa-dhṛk anyatra brāhmaṇa-kulād anyatrācyuta-gotrataḥ iti

acyuto gotra-pravartaka-tulyo yeṣāṁ vaiṣṇavānāṁ tad vyatirekeṇa cety arthaḥ. tathā tan-mahārājasyoktau [Śrīmad-bhāgavatam 4.21.37]
mā jātu tejaḥ prabhaven maharddhibhis
titikṣayā tapasā vidyayā ca
dedīpyamāne ñjita-devatānāṁ
kule svayaṁ rāja-kulād dvijānām iti
atra śrī-svāmi-pādānāṁ ṭīkā—mahatyaś ca tāṛddhayaś ca tābhir yad-rāja-kulasya tejas tat tasmāt
sakāśād dvijānāṁ viprāṇāṁ kule ajito devatā-pūjyo yeṣāṁ vaiṣṇavānāṁ, teṣāṁ kule mā jātu
prabhavet. kadācid api prabhavaṁ na karotu. kathambhūte samṛddhibhir vināpi svayam eva
titikṣādibhir dedīpyamāna iti

purañjanoktau [Śrīmad-bhāgavatam 3.26.24] ca—tasmin dadhe damam ahaṁ tava vīra-patni yo 'nyatra bhūsura-kulāt kṛta-kilbiṣas tam paśye na vīta-bhayam unmuditaṁ tri-lokyām anyatra vai mura-ripor itaratra dāsāt iti

tatrāpi saiva ṭīkā—he vīra-patni yas te kṛtāparādhaḥ. tasminn aham brāhmaṇa-kulād anyatra anyasmin muraripu-dāsād itaratra ca damam dadhe, daṇḍam karomīty adi. īdṛśāni ca vacanāni śrībhāgavatādau bahūny eva santi. ittham vaiṣṇavānām brāhmaṇaiḥ saha sāmyam eva sidhyati

kim ca—viprād dviṣaḍ-guṇa-yutāt [Śrīmad-bhāgavatam 7.9.10]

ity ādi-vacanair vaiṣṇava-brāhmaṇebhyo nīca-jāti-jātānām api vaiṣṇavānāṁ śraiṣṭhyaṁ nirdiśyatetarām. ata evoktaṁ śrī-bhagavatā śrī-hayagrīveṇa śrī-hayaśīrṣa-pañcarātre śrī-puruṣottama-pratiṣṭhānte— mūrtipānāṁ tu dātavyā deśikārdhena dakṣiṇā tad ardhaṁ vaiṣṇavānāṁ tu tad ardhaṁ tad dvijan manām iti

ato yuktam eva likhita sarvair bhagavataḥ paraiḥ pūjya iti. tathā ca brahma-vaivarte priyavratopākhyāne dharma-vyādhasyāpi śrī-śālagrāma-śilā-pūjanam uktam—tataś ca vismitaḥ śrutvā dharma-vyādhasya tad vacaḥ. tasthau sa ca samānīya darśayāmāsa tāv ubhau nirnikta-vasanau vṛddhāvāsanasthau nijau gurū śālagrāma-śilāṁ caiva tat-samīpe supūjitam iti

atrācāraś ca—satām madhya-deśe 'smin viśeṣato dakṣiṇa-deśe ca mahattamānām śrī-vaiṣṇavānām pramāṇam iti dik. evam śrī-bhāgavata-pāṭhādāv apy adhikāro vaiṣṇavānām draṣṭavyaḥ. yato vidhi-niṣedhā bhagavad-bhaktānām na bhavantīti devarṣi-bhūtāpta-nṛṇām pitṛṇām [Śrīmad-bhāgavatam 11.5.41] ity ādi-vacanaiḥ. tathā karma-parityāgādināpi na kaścid doṣo ghaṭata iti tāvat karmāṇi kurvīta [Śrīmad-bhāgavatam 11.20.9] iti, yadā yasyānugṛhṇāti bhagavān [Śrīmad-bhāgavatam 4.29.46] ity ādi vacanaiś ca vyaktam bodhitam evāsti. (Dig-darśinī commentary on Hari-bhakti-vilāsa 5.454 – 455)

Translation: These two verses are spoken by Sri Narada. It should be noted that vaiṣṇavas born in $ś\bar{u}dra$ families have the right of worshiping the $ś\bar{a}lagr\bar{a}ma-śil\bar{a}$. $Ś\bar{u}dras$ and ladies who are not vaiṣṇavas are barred. Vaiṣṇavas born in $ś\bar{u}dra$ families have the right, as specified in the $V\bar{a}yu-pur\bar{a}na$ as follows:

The śūdra should donate to the renunciates, work for agricultural and mercantile activities, listen to the purāṇas regularly, and worship the Śālagrāma-śilā.

Seeing the differences that the original verse has from the *Vāyu-mahā-purāṇa* and other *purāṇas*, certain envious *smārta-brāhmaṇas* consider these *purāṇic* statements to be interpolations. It is to be known that a non-*vaiṣṇava śūdra* or woman, even if fully knowledgeable in the rituals, is not to perform any deity worship. However, there are all provisions for a lady or *śūdra* who is properly initiated in a *vaiṣṇava* line. Those who are *vaiṣṇavas* amongst people born in *śūdra* or outcaste families are not to be considered as *śūdras*. This is given in the *Nāradīya Purāṇa* as follows,

"O King! A vaiṣṇava from a dog-eating family is greater than a twice born brāhmaṇa."

Also, the Itihāsa-samuccaya says,

"The devotees of the Lord are not $\dot{su}dras$, aborigines, or dog-eaters. One who sees them with such an ordinary caste-impelled vision certainly goes to hell."

And the Padma-purāṇa says,

"Those who are devotees of the Lord are never śūdras. In fact, they are known as bhāgavatas. Those who are not vaisnavas in all the four castes are to be known as the actual śūdras."

Similar glorification of *vaiṣṇavas* has been elaborately described previously in this book (*Haribhakti-vilāsa*). It is proved therein that by *Vaiṣṇava* initiation, *śūdras* etc. also attain the level of a *brāhmaṇa*. The verse *yathā kāñcanatāṃ yāti kāṃsyaṃ rasa-vidhānataḥ* (Just as bell-metal mixes chemically to produce gold, all men attain the status of a *brāhmaṇa* by the process of initiation). This was already written previously in the section describing the importance of initiations. Thus, the following statement of *Śrīmad-bhāgavatam* [3.33.6] is justified,

"To say nothing of the spiritual advancement of persons who see the Supreme Person face to face, even a person born in a family of dog-eaters immediately becomes eligible to perform Vedic sacrifices if he once utters the holy name of the Supreme Personality of Godhead or chants about Him, hears about His pastimes, offers Him obeisances or even remembers Him."

The word 'savanāya kalpate' here means that such a person becomes eligible for Vedic yajñas. Therefore, the vaiṣṇavas are counted on the same level as the brāhmaṇas. Furthermore, in the Hari-bhakti-sudhodaya, the Lord says:

"Holy places, banyan trees, cows, $br\bar{a}hmanas$, and myself — these five forms are present in the body of my devotee."

Also, in the Śrīmad-bhāgavatam [4.21.12], it is said regarding Maharaja Prithu,

"Maharaja Prithu was an unrivaled king and possessed the scepter for ruling all the seven islands on the surface of the globe. No one could disobey his irrevocable orders but the saintly persons, the <code>brāhmaṇas</code>, and the descendants of the Supreme Personality of Godhead [the <code>Vaisnavas</code>]."

Here, the word *acyuta-gotra* indicates *vaiṣṇavas* who are on the same level as those sages who originated the other *brāhmaṇa-gotras*, family lines.

Also, Maharaja Prithu himself says in the Śrīmad-bhāgavatam [4.21.37],

"The *brāhmaṇas* and *vaiṣṇavas* are personally glorified by their characteristic powers of tolerance, penance, knowledge and education. By dint of all these spiritual assets, *vaiṣṇavas* are more powerful than royalty. It is therefore advised that the princely order not exhibit its material prowess before these two communities and should avoid offending them."

Here, Śrīla Śrīdhara Svāmī comments, "Great material opulence and the royalty exhibited by those who belong to royal families should not be shown in front of those who are born in brāhmaṇa lineages or the vaiṣṇavas, the worshippers of Lord Ajita. Even a slight show should not be made. Why so? For these personalities are effulgent, even without great jewels and opulences, simply on the strength of their tolerance and austerity, etc."

Similarly, King Puranjana says in Śrīmad-bhāgavatam [4.26.24],

"O hero's wife, kindly tell me if someone has offended you. I am prepared to give such a person punishment as long as he does not belong to the *brāhmaṇa* caste. But for the servant of Muraripu (Krishna), I excuse no one within or beyond these three worlds. No one can freely move after offending you, for I am prepared to punish him."

Here, too, Srila Sridhara Swami translates the verse in his commentary as follows, "O hero's wife. I shall punish whosoever has offended you, except if he be a *brāhmaṇa* or a servant of Lord Krishna."

Similar statements are to be found in plenty in the $\acute{s}r\bar{\imath}mad$ - $bh\bar{a}gavatam$. By this, the similarity of $br\bar{a}man$ as and vaisnavas is proved. Moreover, by the verse 7.9.10 of the $\acute{s}r\bar{\imath}mad$ - $bh\bar{a}gavatam$, it is indicated that the vaisnavas born in castes lower than the $br\bar{a}hman$ as are even greater than them.

Having said this, Lord Hayagriva also says in the Hayaśīrṣa-pañcarātra, Puruṣottama-pratiṣṭhā section, as follows,

"The worshippers of the deities should be given half of the donations, the vaisnavas should be given half of that, and the $br\bar{a}hmanas$ should be given half of what the vaisnavas have been given."

Therefore, all devotees are certainly worshipable. Furthermore, in the Brahma-vaivarta-purāṇa, in the narration of King Priyavrata, we find that the hunter named Dharma also worshipped the śālagrāma-śilā. The verse is as follows,

"And hearing their words with great amazement, Dharma the hunter stood still and saw both his gurus. Both of them were aged, dressed in fine garments, and seated on an elevated seat. In front of them, Dharma the hunter carefully worshiped the śālagrāma-śilā."

Now a description of practical conduct amongst <code>vaiṣṇavas</code> — amongst the devotees in the central and especially in the southern parts of India, it is seen that all <code>vaiṣṇavas</code> have the right to recite the <code>Śrīmad-bhāgavatam</code> and other literature. No restrictions are seen on the devotees of the Lord, since all of them are viewed under the privilege of the <code>devarṣi-bhūtāpta-nṛṇām-pitṛṇām</code> verse from <code>Śrīmad-bhāgavatam</code> [11.5.41]. Moreover, they are not considered to be at fault for giving up their ordinary duties according to the <code>tāvat-karmāṇi-kurvīta</code> verse from the <code>Śrīmad-bhāgavatam</code> [11.20.9] and also according to the <code>yadā</code> <code>yasyānugṛhṇāti</code> <code>bhagavān</code> verse from <code>Śrīmad-bhāgavatam</code> [4.29.46].

OTHER SMRTIS AND ITIHASAS

There are a number of other *smṛtī*s that differ with the *Manu-smṛti* regarding women and their rights. A few examples:

WOMEN CAN CHANT GAYATRI

manasā bhartur-aticāre tri-rātram yāvakam kṣīraudanam vā bhuñjānāghaḥ śayītordhvam tri-rātrād-apsu nimagnāyāḥ sāvitry-aṣṭa-śatena śirobhir-juhuyāt-pūtā bhavatīti vijñāyate (Vasiṣṭha Smṛti $^{[16]}$ 21.7)

If a lady thinks ill of her husband in her mind, then she should keep barley grains for three nights in water and offer them along with flowers in sacrifice while chanting *Gāyatrī* for a hundred and eight times. Thus she becomes purified.

SAME RIGHTS IN VEDIC MANTRAS

Śrīla Madhvācārya quotes the Vyoma-samhitā in his Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya $^{[17]}$ (1.1.1) as follows,

āhur apy uttama-strīṇām adhikāram tu vaidike yathorvaśī yamī caiva śacyādyaś ca tathāparā

Elevated ladies are definitely entitled to the Vedas, just like *Urvaśī*, *Yamī*, *Śaci*, etc.

TWO TYPES OF LADIES

The *Hārita-smṛti*^[18], which is much older and broader in its outlook than the current edition of the *Manu-smṛti*, speaks about two types of women as follows,

dvividhāḥ striyaḥ. brahma-vādinyaḥ sadyo-vadhvaś ca. tatra brahma-vādinīnām upanayanam agnīndhanam vedādhyayanam sva-gṛhe-ca bhikṣācaryā iti. sadyo-vadhūnām tūpasthite vivāhe kathañcid-upanayana-mātram kṛtvā vivāhaḥ kāryaḥ (21.23)

There are two types of ladies — the $brahmav\bar{a}din\bar{\iota}$, who doesn't desire to marry, and the $sadyovadh\bar{\iota}$, who wishes to marry. For the $brahmav\bar{a}din\bar{\iota}$ there is provision for receiving the sacred thread, conducting the fire sacrifice, studying the Vedas, and begging alms at her own home. The $sadyovadh\bar{\iota}$ at the time of marriage should only be invested with the sacred thread and then married."

Srila Thakur Bhaktivinode makes similar points about different types of ladies:

strī-loka śuddha-bhakta ha-ile anya strī-lokake nāma vijñayera pasārī ha-ite pārena. puruṣādigake nāma dite pārena nā. tabe adhika bayaḥprāptā mānyā strī sthala-viśeṣe satarka tāra sahita puruṣa-digera nikaṭa nāma vikraya karite pārena. nāma pracāra-sthale vṛddhā o bālikā strī vyatīta sambandha-rahita anya strī-lokake kona puruṣa-pracāraka avalokana vā sambāṣaṇa karibena nā.

Women who are pure devotees can also become traveling saleswomen for distributing the holy name, but they cannot give the holy name to men. According to time, place and circumstance, and with great care and caution, mature women can distribute the holy name to men. Apart from elderly women or very young girls, men preachers should avoid discussion with women. (*Godruma-kalpāṭavī*^[19])

strī-lokera gṛhasthāśrama o sthala-viśeṣe vānaprastha vyatīta anya kona āśrama svīkartavya naya. kona āsādhāraṇa-śakti-sampannā strī vidya, dharma o sāmarthya lābha kariyā yadi brahmacarya vā sannyāsa-āśrama grahaṇa kariyā sāphalya-lābha kariyā thākena vā lābha karena, tāhā sādhāraṇataḥ komalaśraddha, komalaśarīra o komalabuddhi strī jātira pakṣe vidhi nahe

Women are allowed to enter only the *gṛhastha āśrama* and in special cases the *vānaprastha āśrama*. Although some women, being exceptionally qualified by achieving high education, expertise in understanding the scripture, and the power of abstinence, may take to the *brahmacārī* or *sannyāsī āśrama* and obtain all success, it is not the normal rule, as women are usually of weaker body, faith, and discriminating power. (*Caitanya-śikṣāmṛta*^[20], chapter 2, part 4)

Women are not on the Level of Sudras

There is sometimes an idea that women are on an equal level with $\dot{su}dras$ or even lower than them. Hārita, too, in the same smrti, rejects the idea by giving a solid argument as follows,

na śūdra-samāḥ striyaḥ. nahi śūdra-yonau brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya-vaiśyā jāyante. tasmāc-chandasā striyaḥ saṁskāryāḥ.

Ladies are not the same as $\dot{su}dras$. Why? Because it is not possible that brahmaṇas, kṣatriyas and $vai\dot{s}yas$ will be born from the womb of a parent who is $\dot{su}dra$. Therefore, one must educate and initiate ladies in all sacrifices [or else they'll become $\dot{su}dras$ and there will be fear of everyone degrading into $\dot{su}dras$].

OTHER EXAMPLES OF WOMEN IN THE VEDIC AGE

The time depicted in $R\bar{a}m\bar{a}yana$ is considered to be when the Vedic Age was at its highest point. In the $V\bar{a}lm\bar{i}ki$ $R\bar{a}m\bar{a}yana^{[21]}$, we find the following evidence regarding ladies,

sā kṣauma-vasanā hṛṣṭā nityaṁ vrata-parāyaṇā agniṁ juhoti sma tadā mantravat kṛta-maṅgalā (2.17.10)

And cheerful $Kauśaly\bar{a}$, who was dressed in fine silk and was dedicated to her vows, offered a fire sacrifice by uttering mantras to make everything very auspicious.

THE PATH OF THE TANTRAS

The path propagated by the $sm\bar{a}rta$ - $br\bar{a}hma$, as was a restrictive one as far as education for ladies and $s\bar{u}dras$ was concerned. Examples of this could be found in many places:

amantrikā tu kāryeyam strīņāmāvṛdaśeṣataḥ (Manu-samhitā 2.66)

All samskāras for ladies are to be done without any mantras.

sāvitrī praṇavam yattu lakṣmīm strī-śūdrayornecchantī (Nṛsimha Tāpanī Upaniṣad^[22], 3)

Do not give *brāhmaṇa* initiation to women or *śūdras*.

However, the path of the *Tantras* and $\bar{A}gamas$ was open to women and $\bar{su}dras$. The endorsement of this path by Sri Caitanya and his associates is evident from the stark contrast that the following statement shows in its attitude towards the $\bar{su}dras$:

kībā vipra kibā nyāsi śūdra kene naya yei kṛṣṇa-tattva-vettā sei guru haya (Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Madhya 8.128)

Whether one is a *brāhmaṇa*, a *sannyāsī* or a *śūdra*—regardless of what he is—he can become a spiritual master if he knows the science of Krishna.

Srila Prabhupada makes it evident in his purport on this verse of *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* that the term 'guru' can be applied equally to *vartma-pradarśaka*, śikṣā and dīkṣā gurus.

THE TANTRAS ARE A BONAFIDE WAY OF WORSHIPING THE LORD

Some vaiṣṇavas cringe upon hearing the word 'tantra', associating the term with ritualistic drinking of alcohol and performance of ritualistic sex. In the $Śr\bar{\imath}mad$ - $bh\bar{\imath}agavatam$, however, Krishna clarifies the situation:

vaidikas tāntriko miśra iti me tri-vidho makhaḥ trayāṇām īpsitenaiva vidhinā māṁ samarcaret (11.27.7)

One should carefully worship me by selecting one of the three methods by which I receive sacrifice: *Vedic*, *tāntric*, or mixed.

THE PATH OF THE TANTRAS IS MORE PROMINENT IN KALI YUGA

The Śrīmad-bhāgavatam also says:

tam tadā puruṣam martyā mahā-rājopalakṣaṇam yajanti veda-tantrābhyām param jijñāsavo nṛpa iti dvāpara urv īśa stuvanti jagad-īśvaram nānā-tantra-vidhānena kalāv api tathā śṛṇu (11.5.28, 30)

My dear King, in *Dvāpara-yuga*, men who desire to know the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is the supreme enjoyer, worship him in the mood of honoring a great king, following the prescriptions of both the Vedas and *tantras*. O King, in this way people in *Dvāpara-yuga* glorified the Lord of the universe. In *Kali-yuga* also, people worship the Supreme Personality of Godhead by following various regulations of the *tantras* (revealed scriptures).

Srila Sridhara Swami says in his commentary on this verse:

nānā-tantra-vidhāneneti kalau tantra-mārgasya prādhānyam darśayati

By the word $n\bar{a}n\bar{a}$ -tantra-vidh \bar{a} nena in the verse, the predominance of the path of tantras [over the Vedic Path] is shown in Kali-yuga.

It is therefore not surprising that in the *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* many *tāntric* scriptures are quoted. A partial list is as follows:

Viṣṇu-yāmala-tantra (quoted in 2.6 etc.)
Nārada-tantra (quoted in 2.23 etc.)
Rūdra-yāmala-tantra (quoted in 2.29 etc.)
Gautamīya-tantra (quoted in 1.170 etc.)
Trailokya-sammohana-tantra (quoted in 1.179 etc.)
Sammohana-tantra (quoted in 2.147, 2.185 etc.)
Sanat-kumāra-tantra (quoted in 11.57 etc.)
Bhāgavata-tantra (quoted in 12.376 etc.)

THE TANTRAS ALLOW FEMALE GURUS

The $R\bar{u}dra$ - $y\bar{a}mala$ -tantra^[23] (2.32) says in regard to female gurus:

sādhvī caiva sadācārā guru-bhaktā jitendriyā sarva-mantrārtha-sarvajñā sadhavā pūjane ratā guru-yogyā bhaved eṣā vidhavāṁ parivarjayet

A saintly and righteous lady who is dedicated to her guru, a knower of all the *mantras*, all knowledgeable and who is constantly engaged in worship of the Lord, is eligible to become guru, except for a *vidhavā*, a lady whose husband has passed away.

From this verse it seems that the preferred candidates for women gurus are those who are duly married. However, the same book says that even the *vidhavās* are allowed if the mantra is a transcendental mantra and not a material one:

siddha-mantro yadi bhavet gṛhṇīyād vidhavā-mukhāt (2.113)

If the mantra is a *siddha-mantra* or a transcendental *mantra*, it can be accepted from a *vidhavā*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Eighteen Principal Upanisads, vol. 1, V.P. Limaye, R.D. Vadekar, Poona 1958.
- [2] Atharva-veda with the Commentary of Sāyaṇācārya, Jawaji Dadaji, Mumbai. 1897.
- [3] Rg-Veda Samhitā (Critical Edition with Sāyaṇācārya's Commentary In Four Parts), Vaidik Samshodhan Mandala, Tilak Vidyapeeth, Pune. 1946.
- [4] The Bṛhad-devatā attributed to Śaunaka, Arthur Anthony Macdonell, Published by Harvard University. 1904.
- [5] As quoted in the Vīramitrodaya, Samskāra Prakāśa (pp 402,403,404,405) of Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍita Mitra Miśra, Edited by P.N. Sharma, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Printed by Jai Krishna Das Gupta, Vidya Vilas Press, Benares. 1919.
- [6] Mīmāmsā-darśanam, Jaimini Praṇītam, Śrī Śabara-svāmī-bhāṣyena sahitam, Shri Jibananda Bhattacharya, Calcutta. 1883.
- [7] Manusmṛtiḥ, Śrī Kullūka Bhaṭṭa-praṇītayā Manvartha-Muktāvalī Bhāṣya Samupetam. Jai Krishna Das Hari Das Gupt, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series Office. Benares. 1992.
- [8] Manusmṛti, Medhātithi Bhāṣya MSS. Introductory Comment written by the scribe, Nagpur University Library.
- [9] Śrī Kṛṣṇa-saṁhitā, Translation by Bhumipati Dasa, Edited and Published by Pundarika Vidyanidhi Dasa. Vrajraj Press. 1998.
- [10] Parāśaradharmasamhitā with the commentary of Mādhava. Bombay Sanskrit Series, Government Central Book Depot. 1893.
- [11] Sriman Mahabharatha Thathparya Nirnaya of Srimad Ananda Theertha (Part I, Adhyayas I to IX) with English translation of the original text and notes from the unpublished commentary of Sri Vadiraja Swami thereon by B. Gururajah Rao, B.A., B.L., Retired Sub-Judge (Madras Judicial Service). Bangalore. 1941. Transcribed to Pdf document by Harshala Rajesh.
- [12] Śrī Hari-bhakti-vilāsaḥ with Bengali Translation. Edited by Shri Shyamacharan Kaviratna. Bangabda 1318 (Corresponding to 1911 A.D.)
- [13] Viṣṇupurāṇa, published by Venkateshwar Steam Press. Bombay. 1910.
- [14] Śrī-śrī Viṣṇupurāṇa, Original Text with Hindi Translation by Shri Munilal Gupt. Published by Motilal Jalan, Gita Press, Gorakhpur. Vikram Samvat 2024 (Corresponding to 1967 A.D.)
- [15] Viṣṇupurāṇa, with Śrīdharasvāmī's Sva-prakāśa Commentary, Published by Sri Jibananda Bhattacharya. Published at Sarasvatī Yantra, Calcutta. 1881.
- [16] Śrī-Vāsiṣtha-dharma-śāstraṁ. Edited by Rev. Alois Anton Führer, Ph.D. Bombay Central Government Book Depot. 1883.

- [17] Śrī-brahma-sūtra-bhāṣyam, Śrīmad-Ānanda-tīrtha-bhagavat-pādācārya-viracitam. Śrīmaj-jayatīrtha, Vyāsatīrtha, Rāghavendra-tīrthānām ṭīkābhissamalankṛtam. Edited by R. Raghavendracharya. Published under the authority of His Highness The Maharaja of Mysore. Printed at Government Branch Press. 1911.
- [18] Same as [5].
- [19] Śrī Śrī Godruma-kalpaṭavī, Bhaktivinode Thakur. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. Mayapur. Bengali. 1989.
- Nāma-tattva Multilevel Marketing of the Holy Name, Bhaktivinode Thakur. World Sankirtan Party Inc. Singapore. 1988.
- [20] Śrī Caitanya-śikṣāmṛta, Bhaktivinode Thakur. Sri Chaitanya Math. Mayapur. Bengali. Gaurabda 420.
- Śrī Caitanya-śikṣāmṛta, Bhaktivinode Thakur, English translation by Sri Bhanu Swami. Vrindavan Institute for Higher Education.
- [21] Rāmāyaṇa, Book Two, by Vālmīki, Translated by Sheldon. I. Pollock. Clay Sanskrit Library. © Princeton University Press. 2005.
- [22] Nṛṣiṁha-pūrvottara-tāpanīya-upaniṣat with the Commentary of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, Edited and published by Vinayak Ganesh Apte. Ananda-ashram Printing Press. 1929.
- [23] Rūdra-yāmala, Uttara-tantra, Dvitīya-vibhāga, Edited by Ramprasad Tripathi, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University. 1996.